





## COMMUNICATIONS.

Cincinnati, January 6, 1839.

Dr. BAILEY, Dear Sir, Enclosed you will find a slip taken from the "New York Journal of Commerce," of January 1st, 1839; it is part of a communication from the London correspondent of that paper, dated,

London, November 6th, 1838.

J. Campbell, the author of the Pleasures of Hope, has addressed the following lines against "The Star Spangled Banner." They appeared in the Morning Chronicle of this day.

To the United States of North America, on their striped and starry banner.

United States, your banner wears

Two emblems; one of fame:

Alas! the other that it bears

Reminds us of your shame!

The white man's liberty in type

Stands blazoned by your stars—

But what's the meaning of your stripes?

They mean your negro's scars.

THOMAS CAMPBELL.

A young gentleman, a native of Boston, who was with me when I read this biting effusion, immediately altered it as follows:

United States, your banner wears

Two emblems; one of fame:

Alas! the other that it bears

Reminds us of your shame!

Man's righteous liberty in type

Stands blazoned by your stars—

But what's the meaning of your stripes?

We feel them in our scars!

THOMAS CAMPBELL.

### KIDNAPPING.

The following case will be read with much interest. It is highly creditable to the justice of a slave-holding court, and we take pleasure in recording it. The lawyers employed on both sides, also deserve great praise for their evident desire to see right prevail. Our Indiana friends ought to look to it, that the kidnapping monster who violated their laws, be brought to justice.

Ed. Phil.

Bloomington, Nov. 1, 1838.

FRIEND BAILEY: The following case of kidnapping has just been furnished me by the citizens of this place.

A year or two ago, young Samuel Myers, son of Col. Samuel Myers, of this county, (Fayette), obtained a colored lad by the name of Alfred Turpin to live with him. His father's name was James Turpin. He lived in Williamsport, Pickaway co. He promised to keep the boy till he was twenty-one, and do a good part by him. The boy's father has since died. Some time since, young Myers permitted the boy to go with his brother, James Myers, into Indiana to drive stock. When they arrived there, Myers' uncle, Thos. Fletcher, took the boy, with another free boy who was living with him, to the South with a drove of horses, and sold them both.

The following letters from the attorneys in Alabama, gave the first information to his friends of his and condition. The first was directed to Ebenezer Davis, Esq., of Williamsport, Pickaway co., Ohio.

"Tuscaloosa, Alabama, 25th June, 1837.

DEAR SIR: It becomes our duty to address you on a subject involving the rights and interests of humanity. There is, in this city, a black boy by the name of Alfred, who says his father's name is James Turpin, that he is a free man, and lives near Williamsport, Pickaway county co., Ohio. This boy was sold as a slave here last winter, by a man by the name of Fletcher, living, as the boy says, in the State of Indiana.

The boy says he left his father's, I think last year, in company with a man by the name of Myers, who is a son of Samuel Myers, living near Bloomington, Fayette county, Ohio;—that he went from his father's to the place last mentioned, in company with young Myers to help him drive cattle—that having remained at old Mr. Myers' for a short time, instead of returning home to his father, he went with one of the old man Myers' sons to the State of Indiana to assist, again, in driving cattle—that this young man Myers, instead of taking him back to Ohio, left him in Indiana with Fletcher, with the promise that he, Myers, would soon return and take him back—that soon after, Fletcher started to Alabama with a drove of horses, and took him, the boy in question, with him to assist in the driving of the horses; and upon his arrival here he sold the boy as a slave. This last statement we know to be true. The boy says he is free, and we are strongly of opinion that he tells the truth. He has commenced a suit for his freedom according to the laws of the State.

We write for information in behalf of the purchaser of the boy; but if he is free, we would not lift our hands to fasten slavery upon him. You will be written to by the attorneys for the boy, whose letter you will no doubt answer. We also trust you will do us the favor to answer our communication so soon as you possibly can. Please state as many convincing facts and circumstances as you can.

Very respectfully,

Your ob't servant,

PECK & CLARK,

Attys. at Law."

The same mail brought the following letter to the father of the boy.

"Tuscaloosa, Ala., June 24th, 1837.

JAMES TURPIN:—Sir: Circumstances have transpired in this place within a few weeks, which make it highly important to the interests of the parties concerned, that you should ascertain the truth of the following statement, fully, and truly. If not there, do you know with whom he left that State, and for what place? Is he free? And if so, from what cause? Describe the seat, its situation, size, &c., and when he received it? How far do you live from Williamsport? Do you intend to cultivate? If so, from whom? Can you give us the names of any persons in your neighborhood that have known your son above alluded to?

Answer these interrogatories as early as you can.

CRABB & CAPERS,

Attys. at Law.

P. S. Request John Yates to write us all he may know about the boy above alluded to.

C. & C."

Several letters have passed between the citizens

of this place and the attys. for the boy. The last received is the following:

"Tuscaloosa, Oct. 6th, 1838.

Mr. S. HUGHES:—Sir: In reply to yours of the 16th August last, Alfred Turpin was, by a decree of the court, made last week, declared free.

The proceeds of his labor will be paid over to him. Whether he will return to his home in Ohio or not, we cannot say.

CRABB & COCHRAN,

Attys. at Law.

The original letters are in my possession.

A. WATILES.

## THE PHILANTHROPIST.

EDITED BY G. BAILEY, JR.

CINCINNATI:

Tuesday Morning, January 15, 1839.

### THE ORDINANCE OF '87 AND THE FEDERAL CONSTITUTION.

"Ohio owes it as clearly to her own character—to her dignity—to her integrity, and to the principles upon which the Constitution and the Union have been constructed, to make laws to punish whosoever may within her own territory, violate the rights of Kentucky, and secrete or aid and assist the escape of slaves, as she does to make laws to punish any felon who might take, steal and carry off other's property; or who might receive, secrete and conceal stolen goods, knowing them to be such."—*Louisville City Gaz.*

The pernicious assurance, with which slaveholders reiterate their sophisms, obliges us again and again to recur to truths already familiar to our readers. Ohio owes it "to her own character—to her dignity—to her integrity," to punish her citizens for aiding a slave, in pursuit of his liberty. Why? Does Ohio recognize slavery, as right? Does she acknowledge the rightfulness of the property-holding power over man, claimed by the slaveholder? Has she not reprobated the claim, by excluding slavery from her borders, and solemnly declaring, that all men are created equally free and independent? Thus repudiating and branding slavery, how can "her character," "her dignity," "her integrity," bind her to punish her citizens for helping a man, peacefully to gain that liberty, which she declares, is his birth-right?

"But the federal constitution imposes upon her an obligation, in relation to this matter." What is the obligation? that she should prohibit her people from giving counsel and charity to an innocent man, whom some call a slave? Show the article, the section, the clause, which prescribes such a duty; lay your finger upon it. You cannot. One duty alone is enjoined upon Ohio, and that is, to deliver up a fugitive from "service or labor," "on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due." This provision of the federal constitution is a limitation to her sovereignty, antagonistic to the principles of her constitution, and in conflict with natural justice. It is therefore, as already decided by high authority, to be construed strictly. Justice, liberty, the constitution of the state, our own honor, forbid that the single, narrow obligation created by this provision, should be extended and strengthened by liberal construction or loose inference. The obligation is simply this—that, when the slaveholder claims the fugitive, Ohio is bound to consider the claim, and, should it be established, to deliver up the fugitive. The provision prescribes no other duty. It surely does not obligate this state to throw any obstructions in the way of the escaping slave—until he is claimed as a fugitive. Neither does it bind her to inflict punishment on a citizen for assisting a runaway, though he may know him to be such. Her single duty, we repeat, is, to deliver up fugitives from service or labor, when claimed—she having the sole right to provide the tribunal before which such claim shall be adjudicated.

Our legislature, therefore, in making the harboring or secreting of a runaway slave, a penal offense, has outstripped the requisitions of the federal constitution, and done a work of supererogation in behalf of slavery. Nay, more; it has violated the principles of the state-constitution, by voluntarily acknowledging the rightfulness of the property-holding power of the slaveholder over human beings,—that very power which the state-constitution most clearly disallows. The statute of Ohio on this subject, we regard, as an encroachment on the constitutional rights of the citizens, and an obsequious concession to slaveholding laws.

But it may be questioned, whether Ohio is under any kind of obligation to deliver up fugitives from service or labor, escaping from Kentucky, or any of the states not included in the thirteen original states. Since slaveholders are so extravagant in their demands, it may be useful to inquire, whether far more has not been conceded to them, than they can fairly claim by the compact of Union.

The Ordinance for the government of the north-western territory, passed by "the United States, in Congress assembled, the thirteenth day of July, in the year of our Lord, one thousand seven hundred and eighty-seven, after determining various particulars respecting the form of territorial government, proceeds—

"And for extending the fundamental principles of civil and religious liberty, which form the basis whereon these republics, their laws and constitutions are erected; to fix and establish those principles as the basis of all laws, constitutions, and governments, which forever hereafter shall be formed in the said territory: to provide also for the establishment of states, and permanent government therein, and for their admission to a share in the federal union, on an equal footing with the original states, at as early a period as may be consistent with the general interest:

"It is hereby declared and ordained, by the authority aforesaid, that the following articles shall be considered as articles of compact between the original states and the people and states in the said territory, and forever remain unalterable, unless by common consent."

There were six of these articles, which, be it remembered, were "forever to remain unalterable, unless by common consent;"—by the common consent of the original states, and the "people and states in said territory." Bearing this in mind, examine the sixth article of the great charter of our liberties.

"There shall be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in the said territory, otherwise than in punishment of crimes, whereof the party accused shall have been duly convicted: Provided always, that any person escaping into the same, from whom labor or service is lawfully claimed in any one of the original states, such fugitive may be lawfully reclaimed, and conveyed to the person claiming his or her labor or service as aforesaid."

This article then, which is one of the six that were forever to remain unalterable, unless by common consent, established throughout the north-western territory, Liberty, as the unchangeable rule, to which there could be but one exception; to wit,—a slave escaping into the same from any

one of the ORIGINAL states could be lawfully reclaimed and conveyed to the person claiming his or her service or labor. The framers of the ordinance clearly saw, that the declaration, excluding slavery or involuntary servitude, "otherwise than in punishment of crime," "if it stood alone, would entirely put it out of the power of the slaveholder in any of the states, to reclaim his fugitive slaves, who should once set foot on that territory. Hence, the exception, provided; but this exception, inasmuch as it shows that those, who framed the article, carefully considered all its bearings, proves conclusively, that the rule in all its other applications was designed to be unvarying and unalterable. By the ordinance therefore, if it still remain in force, unaltered and unalterable, no state, established since the date of its enactment, has a right to demand fugitive slaves, of any of the states formed out of the north-western territory. Consequently, Ohio, Indiana and Illinois are not bound to deliver up escaping slaves, except they be fugitives from some one of the original states.

The question now is: are these six articles of the ordinance of '87, still binding on the people and the states in the territory, and on the original states? Do they remain unaltered? Undoubtedly, unless they have been changed "by common consent;" for the emphatic language of the covenant is,—the following articles shall be considered as articles of compact between the original states, and the people and states in the said territory, and FOREVER remain UNALTERABLE, unless by common consent." Stronger language could not be used. A more explicit and solemn covenant could not be entered into among men.

Have these articles been altered by "common consent?" If so; when, where, in what points, under what circumstances? At that moment, it may be said, when Ohio became a member of the Union, and a party to the existing compact for, the fourth article of the same great ordinance provides, that, "The said territory, and the states which may be formed therein, shall forever remain a part of this confederacy of the United States of America, subject to the articles of confederation, and to such alterations therein, as shall be constitutionally made." True, but is the federal constitution nothing more than the old articles of confederation with "alterations therein?" Is it not rather a complete substitute, based on new principles? It is a substitute; a new instrument; a new constitution, entirely. Different in its principles from the old compact of Union, it was not framed, agreed to, or ratified, in the manner prescribed, in the articles of confederation, for their own amendment or alteration. The provision for amendments in these articles was, that no alteration should "at any time hereafter be made in any of them," unless such alteration should be agreed to in a Congress of the United States, and be afterwards confirmed by the legislature of every state. But, the present constitution was framed and agreed to in a general convention of delegates from the several states; was afterwards submitted for confirmation to conventions of the people in the states respectively, not to their legislatures; and contained an article declaring, that the "ratification of nine states should be sufficient for the establishment of this constitution between the states so ratifying the same." Of course, the federal constitution is not a revised edition of the articles of confederation, with "alterations therein," "constitutionally" made.

If this be true, it follows, that the federal constitution, in itself, independent of the "common consent" of the "original states," and "the people and states" in the north-west territory, has no power to alter or modify any one of the six articles, declared in the ordinance, to be forever unalterable, unless by common consent.

But it may be urged, that the very act, by which Ohio entered into the Union, and was recognized as one of the United States, implied the common consent of all the parties concerned, that any principle or provision of the Ordinance, conflicting with the federal constitution, should yield to the authority of this instrument: consequently, Ohio, by "common consent," permitted the exception, contained in the article of the Ordinance prohibiting slavery, to be so extended as to cover the case of slaves escaping from the new states, as well as old. This is mere presumption, not proof. Solemn covenants, formally established, designed for great purposes, and emphatically declared to be forever unalterable unless by the common consent of the parties concerned, we are not to presume, will be changed or set aside, without grave deliberation, and certain formalities in the mode of procedure. Now, there is no record to show, that any one of the original states, or Ohio, or the rest of the inhabitants of the territory, deliberated for one moment, on the bearings of the federal constitution on the articles of the ordinance of '87; or intended, that one of these sacred articles should be modified by the new relations Ohio was about to assume.

Where, then, we again ask, and when, was that "common consent" obtained, by which the provision, securing to the original states the right of reclaiming their fugitive slaves, escaping into the north-western territory, was so extended as to confer upon the new states, the same right?

Until this question be satisfactorily answered, we may at least be permitted to doubt, the right of Kentucky, Tennessee, Missouri, Alabama, Mississippi and Louisiana, to reclaim a single fugitive slave, escaping from their territory into Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, or any part of the north-western territory.

### THE INTENTION OF OUR FOREFATHERS.

"ART. VI. There shall be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in the said territory, otherwise than in punishment of crimes whereof the party shall have been duly convicted: Provided always, that any person escaping into the same, from whom labor or service is lawfully claimed, in any one of the original states, such fugitive may be lawfully reclaimed, and conveyed to the person claiming his or her labor or service as aforesaid."—*Ordinance of '87.*

In any one of the ORIGINAL states;—why not in any one of the states? We ask every candid man whether this peculiarity in the phraseology of the article, does not prove, one of two things—either that the framers of this ordinance and the Congress which enacted it, intended that there should be no more slave states added to the Union, or that being admitted, they should not have the right of reclaiming their fugitive slaves, if found in the north-western territory?

## THE LEGISLATURE OF INDIANA AND THE PHILANTHROPIST.

IN SENATE, Dec. 31, 1838.

Mr. COLE introduced the following joint resolution, to wit:—*Resolved*, That the Philanthropist, a periodical publication, devoted to the advocacy of the immediate and unconditional abolition of slavery, having been forwarded to each of the members of both branches of the Legislature of the State of Indiana and laid upon their desks, on the morning of the 17th of December, 1838, without the same having been ordered, thereof, there be no action thereon.

Be it resolved by the General Assembly of the State of Indiana, That inasmuch as there is no slavery in the State of Indiana to be abolished, they esteem the presentation of said periodical to them as uncalled for and unnecessary, at the least; and that if the same was designed to enlist (if possible) opinion and feeling against rights secured by national compact, they consider themselves called upon to declare, that they view, with sentiments of unmingled disapprobation, the spirit which produces the agitation of anti-slavery feeling in either of those portions of the Union, in which the violence of the immediate abolitionists, who only tend to weaken the ties by which the States are bound together, without any countervailing advantage.

Mr. KENNEDY moved to reject the joint resolution, on the ground, that he wished to place his name on the journals of the Senate, showing his feelings against agitating this question. He did not wish to be forced into an expression of opinion. This was the ground he intended to occupy. He deprecated the discussion of the question; but if it were forced upon the Senate, he would give his views, unless compelled to forbear by the operation of the previous question, and then put down agitation.

Mr. TULEY was opposed to rejecting the resolution. He believed its passage would have a soothing influence on the people of the South. That hundreds of the most meritorious portion of the Southern people were led to believe, from publications, similar to the Philanthropist, that we were bitterly opposed to them. He wished to eradicate this opinion, by the action of the Senate.

Mr. BELL stated, that after he received the Philanthropist he had promptly returned it, and had not been troubled with it since. He was opposed to agitating the subject; but the resolution was not his preparation to do so. But he hoped the question would be met coolly and dispassionately.

Mr. MOUNT said, that the agitation of this subject came from those opposed to the doctrines of the Philanthropist. He hoped the Senate would promptly reject the resolution, and then put down agitation.

Mr. MITCHELL deeply regretted the introduction of the resolution. It was doing what the editor of the Philanthropist intended—throwing a fire brand into the Senate. This matter, under the Constitution of the United States, belonged to the States where slavery was tolerated. The editor would not get an expression of opinion from him.—He would suffer the censure of the Senate, before he would vote.

Mr. COLE referred to the paper, showing that one object of the editor was to agitate the subject, and get an expression of opinion. That after the adjournment of the Legislature, a false impression would be made as to the sentiments of members.

Mr. MITCHELL said the paper was sent there to gull us into an expression of opinion. The resolution had the same object. He was opposed to the agitation of the subject.

Mr. STOKES said: As the yeas and nays have been called for, I shall vote against the rejection, and for the purpose of placing the joint resolution in a situation that it can be amended. In giving an opinion against the interference of the question, that now agitates a considerable portion of the United States; referred by the proposition now before the Senate, we may give a vote having an indirect bearing in favor of a doctrine that we equally deplore, to wit: abridging the freedom of the press. While we deprecate the interference of a portion of the United States, on the subject of slavery, let us not say, that those persons who make this uncalculated interference, shall not have the usual channels of communication to spread their doctrines, and be restrained from the privilege of the press. The laws of our country make men responsible for slanders, and if men see proper to promulgate erroneous doctrines, why let them go forth, leaving the good sense of the American people to reject them. It is incompatible with our form of government to restrain political or religious opinions. Not long since it was urged, by some in power, that those opinions should not be promulgated, but be communicated through the Post office department. This I think was equally wrong. I thought so then, I still think so, I therefore, shall vote against the rejection, believing that the resolution can be so shaped as to leave a non-interference of the State of Indiana, on the question, and also, leave open and unbridled the freedom of the press. I make these remarks, because some gentlemen say, they want to put a stop to the circulation of abolition documents.

Mr. BRANT opposed the rejection. He wished the resolution to pass, that, at the proper time, it might be amended, so as to make it stronger—to instruct our delegation in Congress as to the opinion of the people of Indiana.

The discussion was continued at considerable length, by Messrs. Downing, Williams, Bryant, Walker, Finch, Arion, in support of the resolution, and Mr. Bryant remarked, that the agitation could not now be put down. A resolution on the subject had passed the other branch of the Legislature and would have to be met. A vote to reject would place them in a position, in favor of it, however incorrectly, in the public prints, as abolitionists.

On the question being taken, Messrs. Kennedy, Mount, Smith of W. Stanford, Trimble, Turman and Williams voted in favor of rejection, and the balance of the Senators present, numbering 33, in opposition to the motion.—The joint resolution then passed to a second reading.

TO THE LEGISLATURE OF INDIANA.

The Legislature of Indiana will accept our thanks, for the special notice with which they have honored us. Notwithstanding its members seem disposed to reprobate our efforts, still the formal action they have taken upon them, will doubtless be productive of much good. This movement on their part will be instrumental in introducing the Philanthropist to the people of Indiana, and in more generally attracting their attention to the cause of human rights. This movement we hail, as the first fruit of anti-slavery effort in that state, and a pledge of future success.

Lest we should be thought to undervalue the compliment they have paid us, they will indulge us in a few free remarks on their proceedings.

With due deference, we may presume, that the members of this honorable body, coming up from a community wherein there has been little or no anti-slavery discussion, and from which intelligence respecting events connected with the cause of Universal Freedom has been carefully withheld, are scarcely apprised of the nature of Abolitionism or the power of its advocates. It is possible they may yet have to learn, that the Spirit of Abolition is the spirit of the age; that it is only a particular manifestation of that deep, universal longing, and striving after a better state of things, which is the peculiar characteristic of these times; that the truths it inculcates are nothing more than the principles promulgated by our fathers in their Declaration of Independence; that its latest triumph may be seen in the disenfranchisement within the last six months of nearly 800,000 slaves; and that its power, just beginning to be felt in this country, is already dominant throughout Great Britain, and is now prevailing over Europe, so that ere long, not a civilized nation on earth, save that in Great Britain, it is thought more disgraceful to be an anti-abolitionist, than it is in Indiana, to be an Abolitionist? Are they aware, that within a period of seven years, Abolitionists in this country have multiplied from some half-a-dozen individuals, to hundreds of thousands, maintaining an efficient state-organization in every free state, except one, wielding the power of fifty presses, and, in several of the states, holding the balance between political parties? Do they know that some of the most distinguished men in the republic—scholars, statesmen, divines,—have laid their great minds under contribution for the sake of promoting the cause of emancipation, and that the highest moral feeling of the nation is rapidly arraying itself against slavery? Are they apprised, that in their own state there already exists an efficient organization of men and women, religiously pledged for the overthrow of every form of op-

pression, and determined, by the blessing of God on their efforts, to abolish Indiana, and fill its legislature with men, who shall know the worth of human rights, and be more ready to do honor to the friends of Liberty, than homage to the slaveholder?

We fear these things may have escaped their notice; else, why expect to prevent the spread of abolition-sentiment, by legislative resolves? Can Indiana turn back the current of God's providence, arrest the machinery he has put in operation for the melioration of the condition of the whole human family, and, in the midst of the lights which shine upon her from every quarter of the heavens, surround herself with darkness? Idle effort! The fire is now kindling along your borders. The public mind is heaving with excitement. The people are calling for light. A band of choice spirits among you is scattering the truth on the wings of the wind. Your people have heard something of the agitation abroad in the world. Vague reports have reached them of the West India Jubilee. They see Congress excited. They see all the appliances, which despotism can devise, put in requisition for the suppression of freedom of debate and the right of petition; and observe that they all fail of their object. Discussion, agitation, light, light on all these matters, they demand and will have. And how can you prevent it? By resolves, that there is no slavery in Indiana; that there are certain rights created by the national compact, which must not be touched; that the people of the free states only weaken the bonds of Union, by agitating the question of slavery? Are you, yourselves, satisfied with such resolutions? What if there is no slavery in Indiana, is not Indiana, member of a Union, in one half of which slavery exists in its most revolting forms? Is she not responsible, to the extent of her votes in Congress, for the existence of slavery in the District of Columbia? Has she not insulted the spirit of liberty, and bowed the knee to Slavery, by the enactment of unjust and oppressive laws against men, to whom God has given a colored skin? Is America disgraced abroad, and does not Indiana feel abased? Are the best interests of the nation put in jeopardy, and is not Indiana moved with concern? Is the right of petition trampled under foot, and has Indiana no interest in it? Is the Congress of the United States enslaved, and does not Indiana feel aggrieved? You talk of rights secured by the national compact. What rights? The right to hold slaves, and the right to bid the world be silent about it? Then Indiana, as well as every free state, by your own showing, is responsible for slavery, for they all are equally parties to this compact. If no such rights be secured, then this part of your resolution is without meaning. When you resolved, that the "agitation of anti-slavery feeling" tended only to weaken the bond of Union between these states, did you not tacitly assume that the bond of this Union, was slavery? How, otherwise, could it be weakened by the prevalence of anti-slavery sentiment? Is it a fact, then, that slavery is the bond which unites these twenty-six states under one government, the great interest to secure which the sages of the Revolution assembled in solemn convention, and after the most deliberate and earnest consultation, gave us that Constitution which is now our boast? If so, we are a slave-holding nation, and the guilt of slavery belongs to all the states equally. What then becomes of the notion that Indiana has nothing to do with slavery, because there is none within her borders to be abolished? But, if this system of robbery be not the bond of Union, how is opposition to it, to weaken the ties which bind these states together?

Trusting that your honorable body may see how uncalled for and unreasonable have been its proceedings on this subject, we shall still continue to send our paper to as many of your members (80) as have not yet requested its discontinuance. For, we take it for granted, that these men are too independent to permit any body of men, no matter what powers clothed, to dictate to them what they shall read.

We again would assure those gentlemen, who seem to think it of some importance to acquaint themselves with the facts connected with the progress of one of the most important enterprises of the age, that we send our paper to them, with no intention of holding them responsible as subscribers, should they see proper to keep it.

THE CLERGY OF CINCINNATI—ANTI-SLAVERY NOTICES.

Notices of Mr. Blanchard's lectures were sent twice, in due season, to the pastors of the several churches in this city, with a polite request that they would read them to their congregations. Many among the most respectable of these gentlemen promptly complied with the request: others declined—how many we know not. Those who were kind enough to read our notices, knew that, by so doing, they were not committing themselves to the cause of Abolition, but to the free discussion of a great moral question. They knew that it was a question which must interest their congregations, and in the proper settlement of which every American citizen is deeply concerned; and they were fully aware that it could not be settled without free and fair discussion. They did right, therefore, in advertising their congregations of an appointment for a meeting, to which the subject would be presented in its various bearings. Such a course was compatible with the strictest neutrality.

Mr. Lynd of the second Baptist church, Mr. Thornton A. Mills of the third Presbyterian church, Mr. Johns, pastor of one of the Episcopal churches, Mr. Fere, of the Methodist church, and Dr. Wilson, refused to read the notices. These gentlemen doubtless acted from reasons satisfactory to themselves; and, of course, cannot feel injured that we should thus place their public acts, on record, publicly. "He that doeth truth, cometh to the light, that his deeds may be made manifest; that they are wrought in God." Public sentiment has no terrors for the man, who is conscious of rectitude of intention in all his actions.

We regard, however, the course pursued by these clergymen, as a proclamation of war against Abolitionism. They have violated their neutrality in this matter as public men. Had a notice of a colonization meeting been handed to any one of them, would he have refused to read it? We know he would not.

The lines between slavery and anti-slavery are

being drawn. There is no middle ground, as we conceive. It is well we should know, and that the public should know, who fall on one side, and who on the other.

### FREE DISCUSSION IN CINCINNATI.

The past week was a busy one in Cincinnati. Our fellow-citizens at length seem to have arrived at the conclusion, that light is better than darkness, even on that most "delicate subject," the question of slavery. Nearly every night of the week was occupied with a lecture on this topic, pro or con.

When we said in our last paper, that the pro-slavery champion had announced his intention to bring his lectures to a close for want of an audience, we supposed his determination was final. We have understood since, however, that his steadfast patrons, pleased with his triumphant demonstration that slavery was a Bible institution, prevailed on him to resume his original plan, guaranteeing him against the loss, not of his audience, for this not even military title or ex-senatorial dignity could prevent, but against the loss of his money. Accordingly, on the next Saturday evening, he lectured again, to an interesting assemblage of forty-five on the following Monday evening, to as interesting a group of thirty-three; and on the succeeding Thursday evening, to a diminishing audience, of nineteen persons.

Whether our pro-slavery propagandists will be satisfied with the result of this experiment, designed to convince the Cincinnati public, that God's blessing rests upon a system which annihilates all right, robs the laborer of his wages, denies to him the institution of marriage, and withholds from him the Bible, is yet to be seen. We would suggest to them, however, that hereafter, they should so far consult the proprieties of good society, as not to thrust forth as their champion, a man who has so many reasons to shun notoriety. On the contrary, let them select one of good reputation, to plead their cause, and we shall treat him just as an honest man ought to be treated, with respect for his honesty and charity for his errors.

On Wednesday night, Mr. Blanchard lectured to a larger audience, than either of his former ones. The house was full. We noticed there many gentlemen, who, a few months ago, were noted for their abhorrence of Abolition, and their determination to hear nothing on the subject.

The principal topics of Mr. Blanchard's discourse were, the various remedies proposed for American slavery. Colonization and immediate abolition came under review. His argument against the former scheme was a masterly, we think, a conclusive one; and his presentation of the principle of immediate abolition was full, clear and impressive. Throughout the whole lecture, which occupied two hours and twenty minutes, the people listened with the most earnest attention; and an occasional burst of hearty merriment showed how well they relished the speaker's humorous exposure of the blindness and blunders of half-way men and measures.

On Friday evening, although the weather was quite unpropitious, he had an audience nearly as large as that on Wednesday night, who listened with unabated interest to the Bible-view of slavery. We need not say that the lecture was as instructive and delightful as any that had preceded it.

These lectures have been instrumental in doing great good. This we know. Many minds have been conciliated, much prejudice has been destroyed, many have been made converts to Abolitionism.







